

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,645	04/02/2004	Niall R. Lynam	DON01 P-1148	2833
28101	28101 7590 03/10/2006		EXAMINER	
VAN DYKE	, GARDNER, LINN	SHAFER, RICKY D		
2851 CHARLEVOIX DRIVE, S.E.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
P.O. BOX 888	P.O. BOX 888695			FAFER NUMBER
GRAND RAP	GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49588-8695		2872	
		DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/817,645	LYNAM ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	•	Ricky D. Shafer	2872				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 February 2006</u> .						
2a) <u></u> □	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.						
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
5)	4) ☐ Claim(s) 60-117 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 83 and 85 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
•	6) Claim(s) 60-82,84 and 86-117 is/are rejected.						
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
		•					
• •	ion Papers						
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attach	nt(c)						
Attachmen	n(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/06/2006 has been entered.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 60-62, 64-66, 69-76, 92, 95-98, 100-102 and 104-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobin, Jr ('952) in view of Holt ('539) or Traynor et al ('046).

Tobin, Jr discloses an automobile exterior side view mirror system comprising an exterior side view mirror assembly (10) adapted for attachment to a side of an automobile; said exterior side view mirror assembly including a reflective element assembly (30,32); said reflective element assembly including a first reflective element (30) having unit magnification and a second reflective element (32) having a curvature; said first reflective element and said second reflective element supported at a support element (35), wherein said support includes a frame (20) and a backing plate (14); said second reflective element disposed at an outer, upper portion as well as the lower portion of said reflective element assembly when

Art Unit: 2872

said reflective element assembly is included in said exterior side view mirror assembly and when said exterior side view mirror assembly is attached to the side of an automobile; said second reflective element supported on said support element adjacent to and separate from said first reflective element; a demarcation element (40) of a dark (red) color adjacent said first reflective element and said second reflective element; and wherein the portion of said second reflective element adjacent said demarcation element has a front surface generally coplanar with the front surface of said first reflective element, wherein the second reflective element inherently includes a rearward field of view having a principal axis which is different from a principal axis of the rearward field of view of the first reflective element due to the convex characteristics of the second reflective element which generally extends the rearview field of view outwardly and downwardly with respect to a longitudinal axis of the automobile, note Fig. 4 along with the associated description thereof, except for the demarcation element being positioned between said first and second reflective elements in such a matter that said first and second reflective elements abuts opposing sides of said demarcation element.

Holt and Traynor et al each teach it is well known to employ a small gap between two adjacent mirrors and disposed within said gap a material which serves as a demarcation element in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of providing a clear dividing line and/or demarcation between said mirrors so as to provide a driver of a vehicle with two distinct and separate images, to avoid any possible confusion between the images.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mirror assembly of Tobin, Jr to include a gap or segment (demarcation element) between the first and second reflective elements, as taught by Holt or

Art Unit: 2872

Traynor et al, in order to provide a clear dividing line and/or demarcation between the first and second reflective elements in order to provide a driver of a vehicle with two separate and distinct images to avoid confusion between the images.

4. Claims 67, 68, 84, 103, 108-117 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobin, Jr ('952) in view Holt ('539) or Traynor et al ('046) as applied to claims 60-62, 64-66, 69-76, 92, 95-98, 100-102 and 104-107 above, and further in view of Enomoto ('166) or Mizuta et al ('302).

Tobin, Jr in view of Holt discloses all of the subject matter claimed, note the above explanation, except for an electrical actuator to adjust the orientation of the reflective element assembly.

Enomoto and Mizuta et al each teach it well known to use electrically operated actuator(s) in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of adjusting the position and/or orientation of a reflective element.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the reflective element assembly of Tobin, Jr to include electrically operable actuator(s) as is well known and commonly used and employed in the mirror art, as taught by Oskam or Enomoto, in order to adjust the position and/or orientation of the reflective element assembly.

Moreover, it has been held that providing automatic means to replace manual activity, which accomplishes the same result, involves only routine skill in the art. Note <u>In Re Venner</u>, 120 USPQ 192.

Art Unit: 2872

As to the limitations of claim 84, it is well known to use breakaway exterior side view mirror assemblies in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of folding the position and/or orientation of a mirror.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the exterior side view mirror assembly of Tobin, Jr to include a break-away exterior side view mirror assembly, as is well known and commonly used and employed in the mirror art, in order to fold the position and/or orientation of the reflective element(s).

5. Claims 63, 77-82, 89-91, 93, 94 and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobin, Jr ('952) in view Holt ('539) or Traynor et al ('046) as applied to claims 60-62, 64-66, 69-76, 92, 95-98, 100-102 and 104-107 above, and further in view of Marhauer ('770).

Tobin, Jr in view of Holt or Traynor et al discloses all of the subject matter claimed, note the above explanation, except for explicitly stating that the curved reflective element includes at least one radius of curvature in the range of about 4000 mm to about 100 mm.

Marhauer teaches it well known to select a curvature of a reflective element within the range recited by applicant in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of avoiding distortions.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the curvature of the curved reflective element of Tobin, Jr to include a value, as taught by Marhauer, in order to avoid distortions.

Art Unit: 2872

As to the limitations of claims 77-82, 89-91, 93 and 94, it is well known to use an a curved reflective element having downward and outward angles within the range recited by applicant in order to optimize and/or view a particular rearward field of view of interest.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and/or within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the curved reflective element of Tobin, Jr to include downward and outward angles within the range recited by applicant in order to optimize and/or view a particular rearward field of view of interest, based on user specifications.

Moreover, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to angle the curved reflective element of Tobin, Jr to the selected range(s) recited by applicant in order to view of particular rearward field of view of interest, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art or discovering an optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. Note <u>In re Aller</u>, 105 USPQ 233 and <u>In re Boesch</u>, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

6. Claims 86-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobin, Jr ('952) in view Holt ('539) or Traynor et al ('046) as applied to claims 60-62, 64-66, 69-76, 92, 95-98, 100-102 and 104-107 above, and further in view of Bauer et al ('864) or Kanazawa ('367).

Tobin, Jr in view of Holt or Traynor et al discloses all of the subject matter claimed, note the above explanation, except for the reflective element(s) being a variable reflectance (electrochromic) element.

Art Unit: 2872

Bauer et al and Kanazawa each teach it well known to use electrochromic mirrors in exterior side view mirrors in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of providing variable reflectance and/or reducing glare

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the reflective element(s) of Tobin, Jr to include variable reflectance (electrochromic) element(s), as taught by Bauer et al or Kanazawa, in order to reduce glare.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ricky D. Shafer whose telephone number is (571) 272-2320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RDS

March 05, 2006